UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,428	01/12/2001	Mitchell R. Frank	10004553-1	9973

7590   04/04/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO   80627-2400

EXAMINER
LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/759,428	FRANK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christian La Forgia	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 January 2006</u>.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The amendment of 23 January 2006 has been noted and made of record.

2.   Claims 1-28 have been presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3.   In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re*

Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

4.   In response to applicant's argument that the references of record do not disclose a user

selecting a security rule and displaying information describing the selected rule, the test for

obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into

the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly

suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of

the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642

F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

5.   In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references,

the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the

teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching,

suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir.

1992). In this case, the secondary reference provides a teaching, suggestion and motivation for the combination.

6.   See further rejections that follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

8.   Claims 1-15 and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,339,826 to Hayes, Jr. et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,475 to Shrader, hereinafter Shrader.

9.   As per claims 1, 8, 9, and 23, Hayes teaches a computer system, comprising:

       memory (Fig 2, element 212); and

       a security application configured to display a list of security rules for locking down resources of said computer system (col. 19, lines 50-55), said security application configured to enable a set of said security rules, based on inputs from a user (Fig 17), and to cause said computer system to enforce said enabled set of security rules by modifying a machine state of said computer system (col. 20, lines 1-5), said information based on data stored in said memory (col. 17, lines 60-64).

10.   Hayes does not disclose said security application further configured to enable said user to select one of said Security rules and to display information describing said selected rule in response to a selection of said one rule by said user.

11.   Shrader teaches said security application further configured to enable said user to select one of said security rules and to display information describing said selected rule in response to a

selection of said one rule by said user (column 5, line 38 to column 6, line 34, column 8, lines 5-18).

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the security application to be configured to enable said user to select one of said security rules and to display information describing said selected rule in response to a selection of said one rule by said user, since Shrader states at column 1, line 6 to column 2, line 2 that such a modification would be an improvement to the user interface, thereby making the interface user friendly by preventing an administrator from writing information down from a plurality of screens.

13. Regarding claims 2 and 10, Hayes teaches said security application is configured to display said information immediately in response to said selection (col. 17, lines 65-66).

14. Regarding claims 3 and 11, Hayes teaches said security application is configured to display said list within a window (Fig 17), said window including a plurality of selectable icons (icon besides "Members, Subgroups and Applet Permission", in Fig 17), said security application further configured to display different sets of information describing said selected rule in response to selections of different ones of said icons (Fig 17, right side of menu).

15. Regarding claims 4, 12, and 26, Hayes teaches said security application is configured to display a main window (Fig 17), said security application further configured to display rules of said list in a first sub-window (window of Members) of said main window and to display said

information describing said selected rule in a second sub-window of said main window (window

of Applet Permission).

16.   With regards to claims 5, 13, and 27, Hayes teaches said security application is

configured to categorize said list of rules (col. 19, lines 55-67), said security application further

configured to display categories of said rules in a third sub-window of said main window (Applet

Permission of Fig 17).

17.   Concerning claims 6 and 14, Hayes teaches said security application is configured to

enable said user to select one of said categories and is configured to display, in said first sub-

window, rules of said list that are associated with one of said categories presently selected by

said user (col. 19, line 50 col. 20, line 17).

18.   Concerning claims 7, 15, and 25, Hayes teaches said main window includes a plurality of

selectable icons (icon besides "Members, Subgroups and Applet Permission", in Fig 17), said

security application further configured to display in said second sub-window different sets of

information describing said selected rule in response to selections of different ones of said icons

(window of Applet Permission).

19.   Concerning claims 24 and 28, Schrader teaches wherein said information comprises help

information for informing said user of an operational ramification to said system of enabling said

one rule (column 5, line 38 to column 6, line 34, column 8, lines 5-18).

20.   Concerning claim 25, Shrader wherein said security application is configured to display a
plurality of selectable icons simultaneously with said information, said security application
further configured to display new information describing said one rule based on said selection of
said one rule and in response to a selection of one of said icons by said user (column 9, lines 54-
63).

21.   Claims 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes in
view of Shrader as applied above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,720,033 to Deo,
hereinafter Deo.

22.   Regarding claims 16 and 17, Hayes and Shrader do not teach wherein said selecting is
performed while said list of security rules, including said one security rule, is being displayed via
said displaying a list of security rules.

23.   Deo discloses wherein said selecting is performed while said list of security rules,
including said one security rule, is being displayed via said displaying a list of security rules
(Figure 1 [block 14]; column 8, lines 3-19).

24.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention
was made for the selecting to be performed while said list of security rules, including said one
security rule, is being displayed via said displaying a list of security rules, since Deo states at
column 8, lines 3-19 that such a modification would allow a user to add, edit and change rules as
they applied to various applications.

25.   With regards to claims 18, 21, and 22, Shrader teaches said displaying said information

describing said selected rule in a second sub-window are performed simultaneously (column 9,

lines 54-63).

26.   Hayes and Shrader do not teach wherein said displaying rules of said list in a first sub-

window.

27.   Deo teaches wherein said displaying rules of said list in a first sub-window (Figure 1

[block 14]; column 8, lines 3-19).

28.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to display the list of rules in a separate window, since Deo states at column 8, lines 3-

19 that such a modification would allow a user to add, edit and change rules as they applied to

various applications.

29.   Regarding claims 19 and 20, Hayes and Shrader do not teach wherein said selection of

said one rule occurs while said one rule is being displayed to said user.

30.   Deo discloses wherein said selection of said one rule occurs while said one rule is being

displayed to said user (column 7, lines 54-60).

31.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made for the selection of said one rule to occur while said one rule was being displayed to

said user, since Deo states at column 8, lines 3-19 that such a modification would allow a user to

apply the appropriate rule to the appropriate application, i.e. financial or personnel records.

Conclusion

32.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

33.   The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to ***,

such as:

       United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0095592 to Daniell et al., which is

cited to show a co-pending application.

34.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

35.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

36.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Christian La Forgia whose telephone number is (571) 272-3792.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7-5.

37.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

38.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christian LaForgia
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2131

clf

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100